



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,116	01/11/2001	Ian Andrew Bell	EVC00-003	9875
7590	12/01/2003		EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP			CHOW, MING	
3475 EDISON WAY				
SUITE L			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MENLO PARK, CA 94025			2645	
DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/759,116	BELL, IAN ANDREW	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ming Chow	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,8-25,31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8-25,31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 5, 8, 19, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Venturini et al (US: 5987317).

For claims 1, 19 and 31, regarding registering a first message-indicating device for a user, said device comprising an indicator, Venturini teaches on column 2 line 15 “a network with which the user terminal is registered”. Venturini also teaches on column 3 line 10 “this notification is provided to the user via a message displayed on the display of the user terminal”. The “display” of Venturini is the claimed “indicator”. The display and associated circuitries is the claimed “message-indicating device”.

Regarding receiving notification of receipt of a first communication directed to the user, Venturini teaches on column 3 line 6 “in response to receiving the first signal the user terminal notifies the user that at least one message is stored in the voice mailbox”. The “first signal” of Venturini is the claimed “notification of receipt of a first communication”.

Regarding initiating a first wireless signal to said device wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator activates to alert the user, Venturini teaches on column 3 line 4 “the message station transmits a first signal”. The “transmits a first signal” of Venturini is the claimed “initiating a first wireless signal”. Venturini teaches on column 3 line 6 “in response to receiving the first signal the user terminal notifies the user that at least one message is stored in the voice mailbox”. The “notifies the user” of Venturini is the claimed “alert the user”.

Regarding “said first message-indicating device is independent from any particular telephone line”, Venturini teaches on Fig. 5 and column 4 line 10-13 a message-indicating device on a mobile terminal. A mobile terminal is a wireless unit which is not dependent on any physical telephone line.

Regarding claim 5, Venturini teaches on column 10 line 12 “identifier tag information may be included in a registration message”. The “identifier tag” of Venturini is the claimed “identification code”. Venturini also teaches on column 10 line 16 “the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, ‘Work Office System’”. Venturini further teaches on column 10 line 31 “the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, ‘Public System’”. The “Work Office System” and “Public System” of Venturini are the claimed “one or more types of communications”.

Regarding claim 8, Venturini teaches on column 2 line 59 “a user of the user terminal can be notified if there are messages stored in a voice mailbox”. The “messages stored in a voice mailbox” of Venturini is the claimed “voice-mail message”.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305).

Regarding claim 2, Venturini failed to teach initiating a second wireless signal to said device; wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the

initiating a second wireless signal to said device; wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the initiating a second wireless signal to said device; wherein in response to said second signal said indicator deactivates to the system users.

Regarding claim 3, the modified system of Venturini in view of Neustein as stated in claim 2 above failed to teach second wireless signal is initiated after the user accesses said first communication. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “voice message” of Neustein is the claimed “first communication”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein to have the second wireless signal is initiated after the user accesses said first communication as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein would be able to support the second wireless signal is initiated after the user accesses said first communication to the system users.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Schull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini failed to teach indicator deactivates in response to manipulation of the device by the user. However, Schull et al teach on column 5 line 66 “a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting message can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator”. The “activate the button” of Schull is

Art Unit: 2645

the claimed "manipulation". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the indicator deactivates in response to manipulation of the device by the user as taught by Schull et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the indicator deactivates in response to manipulation of the device by the user to the system users.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 5 above, and in view of LuPorta et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,918,158). Venturini failed to teach first communication is an electronic mail message. However, LuPorta et al teach on column 5 line 18 "an electronic mail to a computer". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the first communication is an electronic mail message as taught by LuPorta et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the first communication is an electronic mail message to the system users.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Houggy et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226). Venturini failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device. However, Houggy et al teach on column 38 line 36 "transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second devices at the same time". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the registering a second message-

Art Unit: 2645

indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device as taught by Houggy et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device to the system users.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 1 above, and in view of Homan et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,317,485). Venturini failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when notification of receipt of a second communication directed to the user is received, but not when said notification of said first communication is received. However, Homan et al teach on column 8 line 12 “the message store provider provides the subscriber with a mechanism to identify which types of messages should trigger notification”. The types of messages that do not trigger notification of Homan is the claimed “first communication”. The types of messages that do trigger notification of Homan is the claimed “second communication”. The “notification” of Homan is the claimed “first signal”. Homan et al also teach on column 7 line 11 “additional sub-menu choices corresponding to the available notify choices: paging notify, outcall notify, e-mail notify, lamp notify, and stutter tone notify”. The device of receiving notification of Homan is the claimed “second message-indicating device”. It is inherent that the second message-indicating device must be registered for receiving the notification. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and

Art Unit: 2645

initiating said first signal to said second device when notification of receipt of a second communication directed to the user is received, but not when said notification of said first communication is received as taught by Homan et al such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the registering a second message-indicating device for the user; and initiating said first signal to said second device when notification of receipt of a second communication directed to the user is received, but not when said notification of said first communication is received to the system users.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305).

Regarding receiving a communication directed to a user; initiating a first electronic signal to a first message-waiting device associated with the user, wherein said first message-waiting device includes an indicator and said first electronic signal is configured to activate said indicator; providing said communication to said user, all rejections stated in claim 1 above apply.

Venturini failed to teach after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 "this feature automatically sets a 'voice message' indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station". The "turned off" of Neustein is the claimed "deactivate". It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed "second") wireless signal to the pager (claimed "device") to turn off the indicator.

Regarding "said first message-indicating device is independent from any particular telephone line", Venturini teaches on Fig. 5 and column 4 line 10-13 a message-indicating device on a mobile terminal. A mobile terminal is a wireless unit which is not dependent on any physical telephone line.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the after said providing, automatically initiating a second electronic signal to said first message-waiting device, wherein said second electronic signal is configured to deactivate said indicator to the system users.

8. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733).

For claim 13, regarding receiving a first wireless signal at a first message-indicating device; activating in response to said first wireless signal; and deactivating, the rejections stated in claim 1 above apply.

Venturini failed to teach the alarm. However, Kyte teaches on column 3 line 5 "a channel signal light corresponding to the pager....visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit".

Regarding "said first message-indicating device is independent from any particular telephone line", Venturini teaches on Fig. 5 and column 4 line 10-13 a message-indicating device

Art Unit: 2645

on a mobile terminal. A mobile terminal is a wireless unit which is not dependent on any physical telephone line.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the alarm as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the alarm to the system users.

Regarding claim 17, Venturini teaches on column 10 line 12 “identifier tag information may be included in a registration message”. The “identifier tag” of Venturini is the claimed “identification code”. Venturini also teaches on column 10 line 16 “the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, ‘Work Office System’”. Venturini further teaches on column 10 line 31 “the identifier tag information in this case may specify, by example, ‘Public System’”. The “Work Office System” and “Public System” of Venturini are the claimed “one of multiple types of communications”.

9. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini Kyte as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305).

Regarding claim 14, Venturini, Kyte failed to teach deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to a second wireless signal. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”)

Art Unit: 2645

wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Kyte to have the deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to a second wireless signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini, Kyte would be able to support the deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to a second wireless signal to the system users.

Regarding claim 15, the modified system of Venturini in view of Kyte and further in view of Neustein stated in claim 14 above failed to teach second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “voice message” of Neustein is the claimed “first communication”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Kyte to have the second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini, Kyte would be able to support the second signal is received after the user accesses said first communication to the system users.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, Kyte as applied to claim 13 above, and in view of Schull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431). Venturini, Kyte failed to teach deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to manipulation of the first device by the user. However, Schull et al teach on column 5 line 66 “a

subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator". The "activate the button" of Schull is the claimed "manipulation". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Kyte to have the deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to manipulation of the first device by the user as taught by Schull et al such that the modified system of Venturini, Kyte would be able to support the deactivating said alarm comprises deactivating said alarm in response to manipulation of the first device by the user to the system users.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, Kyte as applied to claim 17 above, and in view of Houggy et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226). Venturini, Kyte failed to teach registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications; receiving a first wireless signal at said second message-indicating device immediately after said receipt of said first wireless signal at said first device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and activating said alarm of said second device in response to said first wireless signal. However, Houggy et al teach on column 38 line 36 "transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second devices at the same time". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Kyte to have the registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications; receiving a first wireless signal at said second message-indicating device immediately after said receipt of said first wireless signal at said first device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and activating

said alarm of said second device in response to said first wireless signal as taught by Hougy et al such that the modified system of Venturini, Kyte would be able to support the registering a second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of said multiple types of communications; receiving a first wireless signal at said second message-indicating device immediately after said receipt of said first wireless signal at said first device, wherein said second device includes an alarm; and activating said alarm of said second device in response to said first wireless signal to the system users.

12. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305).

For claim 20, regarding a signal receiver configured to receive a first wireless signal generated after receipt of a communication; and an indicator configured to activate in response to receipt of said first signal;, all rejections stated in claim 1 above apply.

Venturini failed to teach said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator.

Regarding “said first message-indicating device is independent from any particular telephone line”, Venturini teaches on Fig. 5 and column 4 line 10-13 a message-indicating device

Art Unit: 2645

on a mobile terminal. A mobile terminal is a wireless unit which is not dependent on any physical telephone line.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the said indicator is configured to deactivate in response to a second signal to the system users.

Regarding claim 21, the modified system of Venturini in view of Neustein as stated in claim 20 above failed to teach second signal is a wireless signal. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 “this feature automatically sets a ‘voice message’ indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station”. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein to have the second signal is a wireless signal as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein would be able to support the second signal is a wireless signal to the system users.

13. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and in view of Schull et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,363,431).

Regarding claim 22, Venturini, Neustein failed to teach a switch configured to issue said second signal in response to user manipulation. However, Schull et al teach on column 5 line 66 “a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator”. The “activate the button” of Schull is the claimed “manipulation”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein to have a switch configured to issue said second signal in response to user manipulation as taught by Schull et al such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein would be able to support a switch configured to issue said second signal in response to user manipulation to the system users.

Regarding claim 23, the modified system of Venturini in view of Neustein and further in view of Schull et al as stated in claim 22 above failed to teach indicator comprises said switch. However, Schull et al teach on column 5 line 66 “a subscriber location after retrieving any waiting messages can then activate the button and deactivate the indicator”. The “button” of Schull et al is the claimed “switch”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein, Schull et al to have the indicator comprises said switch as taught by Schull et al such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein, Schull et al would be able to support the indicator comprises said switch to the system users.

14. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini, Neustein as applied to claim 20 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733).

Regarding claim 24, Venturini, Neustein failed to teach indicator is a visual indicator. However, Kyte teaches on column 5 line 1 “on a side of each receiver unit is a message indicator light for visually indicating when a message has been recorded”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein to have the indicator is a visual indicator as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein would be able to support the indicator is a visual indicator to the system users.

Regarding claim 25, Venturini, Neustein failed to teach indicator is an audible indicator. However, Kyte teaches on column 3 line 8 “an audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit”. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini, Neustein to have the indicator is an audible indicator as taught by Kyte such that the modified system of Venturini, Neustein would be able to support the indicator is an audible indicator to the system users.

15. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733) and further in view of Houggly et al (US-PAT-NO: 5,838,226).

Venturini failed to teach said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal. However, Kyte teaches on column 3 line 5 a channel signal light corresponding to the pager....visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit.

Venturini failed to teach a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm. However, Houggy et al teach on column 38 line 36 transmitting the first signal with the first device to each of the second device at the same time.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal and a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm as taught by Kyte and Houggy such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the said alarm of said second device is also activated in response to said first wireless signal and a second communication waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm to the system users.

16. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Kyte (US-PAT-NO: 6,313,733) and further in view of Homan et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,317,485).

Venturini failed to teach a second message waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm. However, Kyte teaches on column 3 line 5 a channel signal light corresponding to the pager....visually indicating which pager's panic button has been activated. An audible alarm is also emitted through a speaker on the transmitter unit.

Venturini failed to teach said alarm of said second device is not activated in response to said first wireless signal. However, Homan et al teach on column 8 line 12 the message store

provider provides the subscriber with a mechanism to identify which types of messages should trigger notification. The notification triggered by the types of messages of Homan is the claimed “first wireless signal”. The alarm of device (claimed second device) of which receives messages that do not trigger the notification is not activated.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have a second message waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm, and said alarm of said second device is not activated in response to said first wireless signal as taught by Kyte and Homan such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support a second message waiting indication device associated with the first user, said second device comprising an alarm, and said alarm of said second device is not activated in response to said first wireless signal to the system users.

17. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venturini as applied to claim 31 above, and in view of Neustein (US-PAT-NO: 6,418,305). Venturini failed to teach said notification server initiates a second wireless signal toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication; and wherein in response to said second wireless signal alarm is deactivated. However, Neustein teaches on column 14 line 10 this feature automatically sets a “voice message” indicator at the pager apparatus. It is subsequently turned off by the transmitting station after the voice message has been retrieved by calling the central station. The “turn off” of Neustein is the claimed “deactivate”. It is inherent that the transmitting station must initiate a (claimed “second”) wireless signal to the pager (claimed “device”) to turn off the indicator. The “voice message” of Neustein of the claimed “first

communication". It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Venturini to have the said notification server initiates a second wireless signal toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication; and wherein in response to said second wireless signal alarm is deactivated as taught by Neustein such that the modified system of Venturini would be able to support the said notification server initiates a second wireless signal toward said first device after the first user acknowledges said first communication; and wherein in response to said second wireless signal alarm is deactivated to the system users.

***Response to Arguments***

18. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/3/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- i) Applicant argues, on page 3, regarding claim 1 relative to the new amended limitation. Rejections to this limitation has been stated above in claim 1.
- ii) Applicant argues, on page 6, regarding claim 10. The nature (activating said message-indicating device" of the claimed "first signal" has been addressed and rejected in

claim 1. The teaching reference (Hougg et al) recited in claim 10 is to teach “initiating said first signal to said second device when said first signal is initiated to said first device”. Also, claim 10 is a “method” claim. The recited reference meets the teaching requirement of a “method” for the claimed limitation.

- iii) Applicant argues, on page 6, regarding claim 11. Homan et al teach on column 7 line 12-14 multiple choices of message-indicating devices. These multiple devices must be registered for sending message indications. As rejections stated in claim 11 above, for explanation purpose, the following is a scenario. Homan’s “paging notify” reads on claimed “first device” and “outcall notify” reads on claimed “second device” (see column 7 line 12-14 of Homan et al). Homan’s messages that do not trigger notifications reads on claimed “first communication”, and Homan’s messages that do trigger notifications reads on claimed “second communication”. The second communication is obvious different from the first communication (either trigger or no trigger). Therefore, the second communication triggers the notification (claimed “first signal) to be sent to the second device. For the first communication, no triggers (of generating notifications) will be generated at all (reads on claimed “not when said notification of said first communication is received”).

*Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2645

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2645

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Washington, D.C. 20231**

**Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.**

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

